

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/720,801 | Applicant(s) NICHANI, SANJAY |
| | Examiner JOHN B. STREGE | Art Unit 2624 |

All Participants: _____ **Status of Application:** _____

(1) JOHN B. STREGE. (3) _____.

(2) BRIAN MICHAELIS 34,221. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 December 2008

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
- Video Conference
- Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

101 and 102

Claims discussed:

2, and 12

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner explained first that the restriction requirement was improper and therefore all of the claims were being examined. The Examiner further suggested amending claim 2 to incorporate claim 4 in order to overcome a rejection over Dhond et al. The Applicant agreed. The Examiner also suggested amending claims 2 and 12 to insert using a vision system to carry out the steps in order to overcome a 101 rejection. The Applicant agreed and an Examiner's amendment was prepared. .